

REMARKS

Summary of Claim Status

Claims 1-5, 7-16, and 18-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5, 7-16, and 18-21 are rejected for the reasons discussed below. The traversals of the claim rejections of the previous Office Actions and the arguments presented in response to those rejections are maintained and incorporated by reference in this response. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the pending rejections in light of the following discussion.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 12-15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Mucciolo et al., "PowerPoint 2000" published in May 1999 ("Mucciolo"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with regard to all claims. With respect to Claim 12, the Examiner stated in response to Applicants' arguments:

As it was previously presented in the previous Office action dated 7/2/04, the size of presentation material is reduced/enlarged in accordance with the 'width' and 'height' defined by a user in fig. 8.2. Further, this 'width' and 'height' can be set to 2 x 3½ as concedes by the applicant (last paragraph of page 8 in Remarks). Thus, the examiner notes that the technical feasibility alone supports the limitation's anticipation under the 102(a) rejection. It is respectfully noted that the examiner does not need to provide a usefulness of the cited reference when making a 102 rejection.

Office Action at page 2.

Applicants thank the Examiner for an explicit and clear description of how Mucciolo is being read. Applicants, however, respectfully traverse this rejection. In particular, Applicants submit that Mucciolo fails to teach or disclose each and every element of Claim 12, and thus fails to anticipate the claim. As is well-established, the reference must teach every element of the claim and the "identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." See, MPEP § 2131, quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226,

1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Nowhere in Mucciolo is a reformatting mechanism configured to reformat a presentation as a miniature presentation having the size of a business card as recited in Claim 12 taught or even suggested, and the Examiner has failed to provide any evidence that Mucciolo teaches such a reformatting mechanism. Thus, Applicants believe Mucciolo does not anticipate Claim 12.

Moreover, Applicants submit that mere technical feasibility alone cannot be used to support a rejection. Specifically, Mucciolo does not anticipate Claim 12 because Mucciolo does not disclose the claimed subject matter with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation. See, MPEP § 2131.03. As set forth in the MPEP:

If the claims are directed to a narrow range, the reference teaches a broad range, and there is evidence of unexpected results within the claimed narrow range, depending on the other facts of the case, it may be reasonable to conclude that the narrow range is not disclosed with “sufficient specificity” to constitute an anticipation of the claims. The unexpected results may also render the claims unobvious.

MPEP § 2131.03, citing Ex parte Lee, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) (expanded Board). That is, even assuming Mucciolo discloses an infinite number of possible sizes, which the Applicants do not concede, there is no specific teaching of reformatting a presentation as a miniature presentation having the size of a business card. Nowhere in Mucciolo is a business card, or any similar miniature format, even mentioned, much less taught or suggested. As described in the previous response from Applicants, such a size has particular unexpected benefits and results.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe Claim 12 is allowable, and allowance of Claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 similarly recites a miniature version of presentation materials having the size of a business card. As set forth above with respect to Claim 12, Mucciolo does not teach or disclose such a miniature version. Therefore,

Applicants believe Claim 18 is also allowable, and allowance of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-16 depend from Claim 12 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 12 is believed allowable. Claims 19 and 20 depend from Claim 18 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 18 is believed allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 13-16, 19, and 20.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mucciolo in view of Skarbo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,852,807 ("Skarbo"). In the response to Applicants' arguments, the Examiner stated:

[T]he presentation material, according to Mucciolo, can be resized to a size of a Banner. It is noted that the Banner is widely used as a marketing product. Further, both the letter paper and A4 paper are widely used in printing of advertisement.

Office Action at p. 3. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to all claims.

Applicants submit that the examples in the Examiner's response, namely a Banner, letter paper, and A4 paper, are not "a miniature printed version" as recited in Claim 1. As is well-known, a Banner is a large sign that may be displayed to convey a message to a large number of people, and inherent in a Banner is that it is very large so that it may be easily seen. Similarly, letter paper (8.5" x 11") and A4 paper (210 mm x 297 mm) are well-known standard paper sizes that are large and are clearly not "miniature" as claimed in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner either provide support for his assertion that Banner, letter, or A4 size would be considered a "miniature printed version" by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, or withdraw the rejection.

Furthermore, the Examiner states:

Since the examples provided in the Mucciolo reference, wherein on pages 179, 183 and 252-255, are the program and picture advertisements to the audience, and the slides are reduced and

printed on papers, it is concluded that these “reduced” handouts are also used as the marketing products.

Office Action at p. 3. Thus, the Examiner appears to be suggesting that the program and picture advertisements provided as handouts in Mucciolo correspond to a marketing product. Claim 1, however, actually recites “packaging the miniature printed version of the presentation materials with a marketing product.” That is, the miniature printed version and the marketing product are separate elements which are physically packaged together. Therefore, based on the Examiner’s own reading of Mucciolo, Mucciolo fails to teach a miniature printed version as recited in Claim 1.

Finally, the Examiner states that Fig. 3a of Skarbo “discloses various information, such as name, company name, job title, and etc., on the BizCard.” Office Action at p. 3. Applicants again point out that the BizCard of Skarbo is a purely electronic, intangible format, used exclusively for teleconferences. That is, Skarbo specifically teaches away from any physical, printed presentation materials, since it would be impossible to distribute such physical materials in the personal computer conference described in Skarbo. Thus, since Skarbo teaches only an electronic display, it would be impossible to combine Skarbo and Mucciolo in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Claim 1 recites creating a miniature printed version of the presentation materials in the size of a marketing product. Skarbo does not teach or even suggest such a feature. As can be clearly seen in the examples shown in Figs. 7a, 7b, 9a, and 9b of Skarbo, the window displaying the BizCard is smaller than the main windows of the display, and thus is clearly not the size of the presentation materials, as would be required based on Applicants’ understanding of the Examiner’s reading of the claim. Thus, even assuming for the sake of argument that the BizCard of Skarbo corresponds to a marketing product as recited in Claim 1, Skarbo in fact teaches away from presentation materials having the same size.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants believe Claim 1 is allowable, and allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 is believed allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 2-5 and 7-11.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan, U.S. Patent No. 6,192,117 ("Stephan") in view of Mucciolo. Applicants respectfully submit that Stephan and Mucciolo, alone or in any combination, do not teach the invention of Claim 21, and respectfully traverse the rejection.


Stephan merely describes a calling card which has calling card information (such as an 800 long distance toll free number, a PIN, a date and time when the card can be used, and an authorized long distance duration). See Stephan at Fig. 2, and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 6). That is, one side of the card described in Stephan is a business card and the reverse side is long distance calling card information. This information is clearly not a "miniature version of a presentation presented by the person corresponding to the identification information on the first face" as recited in Claim 21. Nowhere does Stephan mention or disclose that the long distance calling information is a presentation presented by the person on the reverse side of the card. In fact, each card in Stephan must have unique long distance calling information in order to allow distribution to many people who would each receive a different card. In contrast, Claim 21 recites a presentation presented by the person on the first face, where all the people who view the same presentation would receive the same business card having a miniature version of that presentation printed thereon.

Therefore, Applicants believe that Claim 21 is allowable over the cited references, and allowance of Claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the final rejection and consider the above arguments. These arguments are believed to clearly indicate that the application including Claims 1-5, 7-16, and 18-21 should be allowed. Therefore, Applicants request allowance of the application. If any action other than allowance is contemplated by the Examiner, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at 408-879-4641.


Respectfully submitted,



Justin Liu
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 51,959

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 29, 2005.

Julie Matthews
Name


Signature